

It was alleged to be misbranded: (1) In that the statements (carton label) "Ingredients—Plant Insulin substances," and (circular entitled "Glucocinine") "(Vegetable Insulin)" and "(Plant Insulin)," were false and misleading. (2) In that representations in the labeling that it was a "plant insulin" which would be efficacious when administered orally in the treatment of diabetes mellitus, that it was "An answer to the intelligent diabetic's prayer," that it was "positively unsurpassed," and that it would help to stimulate the pancreas gland to produce insulin of its own, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for the purposes recommended. (3) In that its label failed to bear the common or usual name of each of the active ingredients.

On May 13, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered delivered to the Food and Drug Administration for technical purposes.

**522. Misbranding of Chase Formula. U. S. v. 4 Gross Packages of Chase Formula. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 3606. Sample No. 37219-E.)**

The label of this product not only contained false and misleading therapeutic claims, but it failed to list the active ingredients in the manner prescribed by law and it failed to bear an accurate statement of the amount of alcohol present.

On January 2, 1941, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Florida filed a libel against 4 gross packages of Chase Formula at Miami, Fla., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Chase Laboratory from Detroit, Mich., on or about October 15, 1940; and charging that it was misbranded.

Examination of a sample showed that the article consisted essentially of a fatty oil (approximately 16 percent), oleic acid (approximately 5 percent), mineral oil (approximately 2 percent), alcohol (by volume 17.8 percent), a small proportion of triethanolamine, and water.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that statements in the labeling that it was efficacious for the treatment of athlete's foot, impetigo, Florida sores, poison ivy, body lice, many types of eczema and skin afflictions caused by external infection; that it would relieve itching and burning of hives and shingles; that it was efficacious in the treatment of muck itch, mango poisoning, and other skin afflictions including many types of eczema, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes. It was alleged to be misbranded further (1) in that the statement in the circular "Chase Formula is greaseless" was false and misleading; (2) in that the list of its active ingredients was not placed prominently on the label with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words and statements in the labeling) as to render it likely to be read by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use; and (3) in that the package failed to bear a statement of the quantity or proportion of alcohol contained in the preparation since the statement on the carton and jar label. "denatured alcohol (25%)," was incorrect.

On January 27, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**523. Misbranding of Savol and Savol Cream. U. S. v. 39 Packages of Savol and 20 Packages of Savol Cream. Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 3648, 3649. Sample Nos. 19670-E, 19671-E.)**

The labels of both of these products, in addition to bearing false and misleading therapeutic claims, also failed to bear the required ingredient and quantity of contents statements. Furthermore, the bottles holding the Savol solution were packed in unnecessarily large cartons.

On January 9, 1941, the United States attorney for the Western District of New York filed libels against the above-named products at Buffalo, N. Y., alleging that they had been shipped by the Savol Chemical Co. from Mercer, Pa., on or about September 3 and October 1 and 30, 1940; and charging that they were misbranded.

Analyses of samples showed that Savol consisted essentially of cresols, alkali soaps, a small amount of phenol, and water; and that Savol Cream consisted essentially of zinc oxide, barium sulfate, and petrolatum, together with perfume materials. Bacteriological examination showed that Savol Cream was not antiseptic.

Savol was alleged to be misbranded in that representations in the labeling that it would be efficacious in the treatment of nasal catarrh, hay fever, bites of animals, and irritation of the throat; and that it would be efficacious as a preventive of infected sores, abscesses, boils, felons, and all complications due to infections, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes. Savol Cream was alleged to be misbranded in that representations in the labeling that it would be efficacious as an antiseptic for cuts, bites of animals, all forms of piles, skin affections in general, sore throat, croup, enlarged glands, boils, felons, ulcers, eczema; or as an after treatment of boils, felons, carbuncles, and erysipelas, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

Both products were alleged to be misbranded further (1) in that their labels failed to bear the common or usual names of the active ingredients, and (2) in that the label failed to bear an accurate statement of the quantity of contents. Savol was alleged to be misbranded further in that its container was so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading.

On February 10, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the products were ordered destroyed.

**524. Misbranding of Waft-Surgical. U. S. v. 19 Bottles of Waft-Surgical. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 3299. Sample No. 15982-E.)**

On October 28, 1940, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri filed a libel against 6 8-ounce bottles, 6 pint bottles, 6 quart bottles, and 1 gallon bottle of Waft-Surgical at University City, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped by Waft Products, Inc., from Springfield, Ill., on or about August 31, 1940; and charging that it was misbranded. It was labeled in part: "Waft-Surgical Antiseptic-Disinfectant-Deodorant-Fungicide-Germicide-Parasiticide."

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of water, formaldehyde, small amounts of turpeneol, and a yellow-green coloring material.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that representations in the labeling that it would be efficacious as an antiseptic, disinfectant, fungicide, germicide or parasiticide in the dilutions suggested; that it would be of value as a wet dressing or irrigation in wounds in these dilutions; that it would penetrate the environment; that it would inhibit disease-producing micro-organisms; that it would be efficacious for the sterilization of surgical instruments and that it would be a reliable fungicide or germicide for animals, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the label did not contain the common or usual names of the active ingredients.

On December 7, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**525. Misbranding of Common-Sense Liniment. U. S. v. 22 Large and 45 Small Bottles of Common-Sense Liniment. Default decree of destruction. (F. D. C. No. 3144. Sample No. 16818-E.)**

On or about October 7, 1940, the United States attorney for the Western District of Missouri filed a libel against 67 bottles of Common-Sense Liniment at Kansas City, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped by T. H. Jackson & Co. from Quincy, Ill., on or about August 8, 1940; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample showed that the article consisted essentially of linseed oil, pine oil, guaiacol, paraffin oil, and a small amount of ammonia.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that certain statements appearing in the labeling were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for the purposes named in said statements. These statements represented that it was a penetrating, common-sense treatment for ailments of man requiring an external application; that it possessed healing and relieving properties; and that it would be efficacious in the treatment of muscular rheumatism, sciatic rheumatism, nervous headache, lame back, pains in the side and breast caused by colds or injuries, earache, partial deafness caused by cold, roaring in the ear, hardening of the wax and inflammation of the muscles and nerves of the ear, dryness of the ear drum, sore throat and neck, stiff joints and contracted cords, chilblains, frost-bitten and tender feet, corns, soft corns and bunions, sprains, bruises, all cuts, sores, and bites of poisonous insects. The said state-